

### REMARKS

This amendment is filed in an RCE in response to the final action of October 19, 2007. New dependent claims 17-20 have been added.

The former novelty rejection has been withdrawn but claims 1-16 have newly been rejected for obviousness based on *Bates et al.* The Examiner has considered but not commented upon the remarks made in the amendment filed on August 3, 2007 for the stated reason of being moot in view of the new ground of rejection. However, applicant refers the Examiner back to those remarks which are still pertinent to the issue at hand and which provide a good discussion of the *Bates et al* reference as compared to the original language of the claimed invention and as still contained in the amended (more limited) independent claims. In *Bates et al*, the basic principle is to let the calendar program mechanically sort out the scheduled events, so that human users can only react to what already happened. In the present invention, an impending schedule conflict triggers a presentation in response to which instructions are received for processing overlapping events. Thus, it can be decided how to handle the situation before the scheduling requests that caused the overlap situation mature into actual event markings in the calendar.

The Examiner admits that the particular combination claimed, i.e., deleting an overlapping event, removing an overlapping event, silencing an overlapping event is not disclosed in the reference. The contribution of applicant is to show that these particular acts can be performed in conjunction with a received high priority calendar event in a way that is both time-saving and that avoids the possibility of the user not noticing and mistakenly leaving overlapping data and thus not deleted, removed or silenced. The claimed handling of overlapping events is advantageous over the prior art, since if a high priority event covers a long period of time, there is advantageously presented a selection for deleting, removing or silencing overlapping events. This makes it easy to quickly and properly handle calendar events, for example when changing duties, or being released from former ones marked in a calendar, or if having

a long vacation.

The claimed combinations as expressed in the independent claims are not contemplated by the prior art handling of high priority calendar events and overlapping events as evidenced by *Bates et al.* For instance, the *Bates et al* reference does not seem to distinguish between deletion and removal as presently claimed and furthermore doesn't seem to contemplate silencing at all. The Examiner's citation of paragraph [0020] of *Bates et al* is noted but the re-evaluation of a previously overridden meeting overlooks the present invention's provision of multiple possible handling actions including not only keeping overridden meetings but deletion and silencing. It is not believed that the *KSR* decision cited by the Examiner would go so far as to lead to a conclusion that the particular acts recited in combination (deleting, removing, silencing) could be improved in the claimed manner by one of ordinary skill based on *Bates et al* without more.

Moreover, all of the independent claims have been amended to include at the end the following limitation:

“...selecting certain overlapping events and for allocating a memory block usage according to the selection of the certain overlapping events.”

Support may be found for instance at page 8, line 27 through page 9, line 10 and page 15, lines 17-27 (paragraphs [0022], [0023] and [0036] of US 2005/0177404).

The new dependent claims 17-20 add the limitation that the “removing” comprises removing the overlapping event to the memory block for possible later recovery in case of cancellation of an added high priority event.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of October 19, 2007, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-16 to issue, as amended, is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Francis J. Maguire/

Francis J. Maguire  
Registration No. 31,391  
Attorney for the Applicant

FJM/lk  
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, PO Box 224  
Monroe CT 06468  
(203) 261-1234